



AF / 217 / 120
\$

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title: "Credibility rating platform"

Applicants: Kraft et al.

Attorney Docket No.: ARC920000147US1

Serial No.: 09/805,808

Examiner: Hanh B. Thai

Filed: March 13, 2001

Art Unit: 2171

5

Mail Stop: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

JUL 08 2004

Technology Center 2100

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

10 This appeal brief is submitted under 35 U.S.C. §134. This appeal is further to Appellants' Notice of Appeal filed April 9, 2004.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
(1)	Real Party in Interest	2
(2)	Related Appeals / Interferences	2
(3)	Status of Claims	2
(4)	Status of Amendments	2
(5)	Summary of Invention	2
(6)	Issues Presented for Review	3
(7)	Grouping of Claims	3
(8)	Arguments	3
App. A	Appealed Claims	14

07/08/2004 RHEBRAHT 00000042 090441 09805808

01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

ARC920000147US1

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation.

(2) Related Appeals / Interferences

No other appeals or interferences exist that relate to the present application or appeal.

5

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-31 are pending and remain in the application. By the Final Office Action dated January 9, 2004, the Examiner has rejected (1) claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention and (2) claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C.

10 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,420 (hereinafter “Lang”) in view of Sharnoff et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,421 (hereinafter “Sharnoff”). All of the pending claims and all of the rejections are hereby appealed. A copy of the appealed claims is enclosed herewith as Appendix A.

(4) Status of Amendments

15 No amendments are outstanding.

(5) Summary of Invention

20 The present invention relates to a system for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search. The system comprises an information gathering device adapted to retrieve the document from an information source, an information analysis device adapted to determine an online id associated with the document, and a credibility rating system adapted to provide the credibility rating associated with the online id to the information analysis device. The system is adapted to allow a user to retrieve the credibility rating associated with the document.

(6) **Issues Presented for Review**

The issues for review are (1) whether claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention and (2) whether claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are unpatentable over Lang in view of Sharnoff.

5

(7) **Grouping of Claims**

Claims 1-9, 24, 25, and 27-29 are grouped together and stand and fall together.

Claims 10-13 are grouped together and stand and fall together.

Claims 14-19, 26, and 31 are grouped together and stand and fall together.

Claims 20-21 are grouped together and stand and fall together.

10 Claims 22-23 are grouped together and stand and fall together.

(8) **Arguments**

A. Introduction

15 The issues for review are (1) whether claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention and (2) whether claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are unpatentable over Lang in view of Sharnoff.

B. Whether claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention

20 Applicants respectfully traverse the indefiniteness rejection of claims 10-13 and submit that claims 10-13 are not indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In support of this position, Applicants submit the following arguments.

1. Legal Standards for Indefiniteness

25 The following legal authorities set the general standards in support of Applicants' position of claims 10-13 not be indefinite, with emphasis added for added clarity:

- MPEP §706.03(d). “[A] full explanation of the deficiency of the claims should be supplied. Whenever possible, identify the particular term(s) or limitation(s) which render the claim(s) indefinite and state why such term or limitation renders the claim indefinite. If the scope of the claimed subject matter can be determined by one having ordinary skill in the art, a rejection using this form paragraph would not be appropriate.”
- MPEP §2173.01. “Claim Terminology[:] . . . As noted by the court in *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 160 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971), a claim may not be rejected solely because of the type of language used to define the subject matter for which patent protection is sought.”
- MPEP § 2173.02 Clarity and Precision[:] . . . In reviewing a claim for compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the examiner must consider the claim as a whole to determine whether the claim apprises one of ordinary skill in the art of its scope and, therefore, serves the notice function required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph >by providing clear warning to others as to what constitutes infringement of the patent<. See, e.g., *Solomon v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 216 F.3d 1372, 1379, 55 USPQ2d 1279, 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also *In re Larsen*, No. 01-1092 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2001) (unpublished) (The preamble of the Larsen claim recited only a hanger and a loop but the body of the claim positively recited a linear member. The court observed that the totality of all the limitations of the claim and their interaction with each other must be considered to ascertain the inventor’s contribution to the art. Upon review of the claim in its entirety, the court concluded that the claim at issue apprises one of ordinary skill in the art of its scope and, therefore, serves the notice function required by 35 U.S.C. 112 paragraph 2.).”
- MPEP § 2173.02 Clarity and Precision[:] . . . >If the language of the claim is such that a person of ordinary skill in the art could not interpret the metes and bounds of the claim so as to understand how to avoid infringement, a rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph would be appropriate. See *Morton Int’l, Inc. v. Cardinal Chem. Co.*, 5 F.3d 1464, 1470, 28 USPQ2d 1190, 1195 (Fed. Cir. 1993). However, if the language used by applicant satisfies the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, but the examiner merely wants the applicant to improve the clarity or precision of the language used, the claim must not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rather, the examiner should suggest improved language to the applicant.”

2. Application of the Indefiniteness Standard to the Present Invention

By the Final Office Action dated January 9, 2004, the Examiner has rejected (1) claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, is improper for (1) failing to provide “a full explanation of the deficiency of the claims” and (2) for failing to “identify the

particular term(s) or limitation(s) which render the claim(s) indefinite and state why such term or limitation renders the claim indefinite”. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the scope of the claimed subject matter can be determined by one having ordinary skill in the art, and, therefore, that a rejection under this paragraph is not appropriate. (See MPEP §706.03(d).)

Also, Applicants respectfully submit that the language of claims 10-13 satisfies the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserted that “claim 10 . . . is confusing.” Therefore, the Examiner merely wanted Applicants to improve the clarify or precision of the language used in the claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, is improper since “the claim must not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rather, the examiner should suggest improved language to the applicant” and the Examiner failed to suggest improved language to Applicants.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the language of claims 10-13 satisfies the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, is improper.

C. Whether claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are unpatentable over Lang in view of Sharnoff

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of claims 1-31 over Lang in view of Sharnoff, and submit that claims 1-31 are not obvious o over Lang in view of Sharnoff, and are patentable thereover. In support of this position, Applicants submit the following arguments.

1. Legal Standards for Obviousness

The following legal authorities set the general standards in support of Applicant’s position of non obviousness, with emphasis added for added clarity:

- MPEP §2143.03, “All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested: To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, **all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art**. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). **"All words in a claim must be considered** in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA

1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).”

- 5 • MPEP §2143.01, “The Prior Art Must Suggest The Desirability Of The Claimed
Invention: There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the
nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of
persons of ordinary skill in the art.” In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453,
1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (**The combination of the references taught every element of**
10 **the claimed invention, however without a motivation to combine, a rejection based**
on a prima facie case of obvious was held improper.). The level of skill in the art
cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. Al-Site Corp. v.
VSI Int’l Inc., 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- 15 • “**Obviousness cannot be established** by combining the teachings of the prior art to
produce the claimed invention, **absent some teaching or suggestion** supporting the
combination.” In re Fine, 837 F.2d at 1075, 5 USPQ2d at 1598 (citing ACS Hosp. Sys. v.
Montefiore Hosp., 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). **What a**
20 **reference teaches** and whether it teaches toward or **away from the claimed invention**
are questions of fact. See Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp., 724 F.2d 951, 960-61, 220 USPQ
592, 599-600 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 835, 83 L. Ed. 2d 69, 105 S. Ct. 127
(1984). “
- 25 • “When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be **some**
teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. See In re Geiger, 815
F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” **Obviousness can only be**
established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the
30 **claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation** to do so
found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge
generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2143.01; In re Kotzab,
217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000); In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071,
5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed.
Cir. 1992).
- 35 • “With respect to core factual findings in a determination of patentability, however, the
Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or
experience -- or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense.
Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of
40 these findings.” See In re Zurko, 258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
- “We have noted that **evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine** may
flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in
the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved, see Pro-Mold &
Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed.

Cir. 1996), Para-Ordinance Mfg. v. SGS Imports Intern., Inc., 73 F.3d 1085, 1088, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1240 (Fed. Cir. 1995), although "the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references," Rouffet, 149 F.3d at 1355, 47 USPQ2d at 1456. The range of sources available, however, does not diminish the requirement for actual evidence. That is, **the showing must be clear and particular**. See, e.g., C.R. Bard, 157 F.3d at 1352, 48 USPQ2d at 1232. **Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not "evidence."** E.g., McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co., 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact."); In re Sichert, 566 F.2d 1154, 1164, 196 USPQ 209, 217 (CCPA 1977)." See In re Dembiczak, 175 F. 3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

- "To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, **this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references** that create the case of obviousness. In other words, **the examiner must show reasons** that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references **for combination in the manner claimed**." See In re Rouffet, 149, F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
- The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious **unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination**. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, **there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference** to do so." 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references).
- If the **proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory** for its intended purpose, **then there is no suggestion or motivation** to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

2. Application of the Obviousness Standard to the Present Invention

By the Final Office Action dated January 9, 2004, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sharnoff. In order to form a proper obviousness rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a collection of references together must teach or suggest each element of the claim, including the relationships between the elements. If any element is not fully taught by the combined references, the rejection cannot be sustained.

Evaluating Lang and Sharnoff in this light, it is appropriate to examine the portions of Lang and Sharnoff which the Examiner has pointed to as teaching the claimed elements of the rejected claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 are not unpatentable over Lang in view of Sharnoff under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants' invention is directed to determining an online ID associated with a document and then identifying a credibility rating associated with the online ID to evaluate the credibility of the document, as well as establishing a credibility rating for an online ID. The combination of Lang and Sharnoff does not disclose or suggest at least these features of Applicants' invention.

Lang does not disclose or suggest being able to determine an online ID associated with at least one author of the document as is claimed by Applicant. Rather, the extraction means 17 of Lang extracts the raw informons 19 from a data stream 15. The "content" of the informons is used to identify whether the informon is of interest. (Col. 6, lines 59-67). The extraction means can also use a community profile and a user profile for user #1 (5) to determine whether the "informon content" is relevant to the community of which user #1 is a part. (Col. 7, lines 5-8). As shown in FIG. 1, user #1 (5) is the requestor of information that is extracted from the data stream. The extraction means 17 does not determine an online ID of an informon.

Lang deals with concept based indexing, wherein based upon a community profile C, a queue can be formed that includes informons related to the community profile C. (Col. 12, lines 25-30). A list of informons M for each concept is stored. "Community profiles" are maintained for each M. This is not the same as an "online ID" associated with at least one author of a document.

Sharnoff does not overcome the deficiencies of Lang. The Examiner notes that Lang does not disclose or suggest "the credibility rating with the online ID." It is submitted that Sharnoff also does not disclose or suggest a "credibility rating" as claimed by Applicants. Sharnoff is strictly limited to a "document indexing mechanism" and document filtering based

on the indexes. The “indexes” of Sharnoff have nothing to do with “credibility” or a “credibility rating” as claimed by Applicants. Rather, Sharnoff relates to being able to identify duplicates or near duplicates of messages and documents. The credibility of these duplicates or the “information pollution” is never evaluated or determined in Sharnoff. The “indexes” in Sharnoff relate subsets of scores that are calculated when the document or message is parsed into elements, where each element is a fixed number of words. The scores are stored in a database and when a new document or message is received, the new document is also parsed into elements of the same fixed number of words. The score for each element can be compared to the database to see if a “match” exists. (Col. 6, lines 1-62; Col. 7, line 8 to Col. 12, line 19). Sharnoff merely evaluates the “content” of a document by parsing it into elements that are scored versus the content of documents previously received, which are also parsed into elements and scored. Applicants’ invention is much different because it is the credibility of the online ID that is associated with the document. When Applicants’ invention receives a document, it does not look for a similar document. Rather, it seeks out the credibility rating for the online ID, which is the one or more authors of the document. An association can then be made between the credibility of the author and the credibility of the document.

For example, in Sharnoff when a document is received it is “parsed into elements.” (Col. 7, line 12). The “elements” comprise a fixed number of words, such as 3 word elements. (Col. 6, lines 7-24). The elements, or e.g., the sequence of three words, are given a score. (see e.g., Col. 6, lines 32-46; Col. 7, lines 27-29). The “score” in Sharnoff has nothing to do with a “credibility” of the document or source of the document as in Applicants’ invention. The “score” is merely the result of a “deterministic pseudo-random number generator” as applied to an element, or e.g. a sequence of three words. (Col. 6, lines 33-47). Sharnoff does not disclose or suggest any relationship between the “credibility rating associated with the on-line id” and the “score” of a series of “elements”.

Once a “score” is calculated in Sharnoff, it can be compared to indexes in the database to see if the same “element” or sequence of words has previously appeared in another document

for which the scores are stored. (see e.g., Col. 6, lines 54-62; Col. 7, lines 59-67; Col. 10, lines 58-59). If there is a “match”, the matching document can be retrieved (Col. 6, lines 56-58), or in another embodiment, a message counter is incremented. (Col. 10, lines 14-16).

In essence, all that Sharnoff discloses is a process to “match a new document” to a database. (Col. 7, lines 62-64). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Sharnoff of any further evaluation of the document in terms of “credibility” as is claimed and disclosed by Applicants. Sharnoff can see the determination that a score is in the database, or that the same message has been received more than once, to filter the message from other users, i.e. to avoid duplicate or undesired messages or documents. (see e.g., Col. 11, line 31 to Col. 12, lines 12).

Furthermore, Applicants’ invention according to claim 1 recites determining an “online id associated with at least one author of the document.” Sharnoff does not, as the Examiner suggests, disclose “retrieving credibility rating from the database associated with the online ID document.” There is absolutely nothing “online” about the “message ID” or “score” disclosed by Sharnoff. Rather, in Sharnoff, as described previously, the “score” relates to a numerical value that is determined for elements of the document. Each message is given an identifier. (Col. 11, lines 1-2). For each “score” in the database, at least one message ID will be associated with the score. Neither the “message ID” nor the “score” correspond to the “online ID” of Applicants’ invention.

It is submitted that there is no motivation to combine references as proposed by the Examiner. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. (See M.P.E.P. §2142). The “information pollution” referred to by the Examiner and Sharnoff generally refers to the ability of computer to “duplicate and propagate” information. This does not necessarily relate to the “credibility” of the information. “Credible” information could just as easily be duplicated and propagated. Sharnoff strives to use its document indexing system to identify duplicates of messages, which can then, if desired, filtered them out. (Col. 4, lines 41-47; Col. 12, lines 13-19).

Sharnoff cannot determine if a document or an “online ID” associated with the document is credible. Even an unsolicited or unwanted document could be credible or at least have a “credibility rating” associated with. Sharnoff cannot generate a credibility rating or determine a credibility rating for an online ID associated with a document. Rather, Sharnoff can only take a document, separate the words into sets of words to form elements, and then calculate a numeric or “score” for each element. The scores of each element are then compared to the database for matches. The scores have nothing to do with “credibility” as is claimed and recited by Applicants.

The Examiner’s proposition that Applicants’ invention would be obvious as recited in the claims is not supported by the factual contents of Lang in view of Sharnoff. The references themselves and/or the knowledge generally available to one of skill in the art do not provide the requisite motivation or suggestion to modify the references as proposed for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). When “the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such a teaching or suggestion appears in the reference”. In re Rijckaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner is requested to provide an indication as to where any such teaching, suggestion or motivation appears in the reference. Absent such a teaching, it is submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Lang in view of Sharnoff under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not established. Therefore, claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 should be allowable.

Claims 2-9, 15-19, 21 and 23-31 depend from allowable independent claims and should also be allowable at least in view of the respective dependencies.

Regarding claims 6-9. neither Lang nor Sharnoff disclose or suggest at least an input validator as claimed by Applicants. There is nothing in either Lang or Sharnoff that allows an input by an owner to be verified. In Applicants’ invention, the information that is inputted is structured in such a way that it can be verified by the system (see e.g. pg. 11, line 1 through pg. 13, line 20.)

Claim 10 is not unpatentable because neither Lang nor Sharnoff allow an owner of an online ID to input credibility information associated with the online ID into the system for validation. Furthermore, neither Lang nor Sharnoff disclose or suggest an input validator to verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted information.

5 At most, Lang has a user profile or community profile for the User #1, the user generating the informon requests. This is not the same as inputting “credibility” information, or validating the “credibility” information as is claimed by Applicants. The Examiner is respectfully mistaken in making a correlation between the “community profile” of Land and the “credibility database” of Applicants’ invention. The community profile is merely used to
10 establish preferences that can be used to determine if the informon content is “relevant to the community of which User #1 is a part.” (Col. 7, lines 5-8) This is much different than the credibility of an online ID associated with the document. Information might be relevant, but may or may not be credible. Its credibility is what Applicants’ invention determines, not just its relevance. Thus claim 10, and claims 11-13, that depend therefrom are not disclose or
15 suggested and should be allowable.

Applicants respectfully note that Lang and Sharnoff have been combined improperly. References may be combined under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) only if the references are analogous art. In this case Lang and Sharnoff are not analogous art. A reference is analogous art if:

- 1) The reference is in the same field of endeavor as the applicant’s, or
- 20 2) The reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned.

Neither Lang nor Sharnoff are in the same field as the Applicants’ invention. Lang is directed to a search engine for receiving informons from a network and filtering the informons for relevancy. Sharnoff on the other hand is directed to a document indexing system for avoid
25 duplicates or near duplicates of the same document. Applicants’ invention quite differently is directed to ascertaining a credibility of an author of a document via an online ID and associating a credibility rating of the online ID with the document.

Since Lang and Sharnoff are not in the same field of endeavor as the Applicants' endeavor and are not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicants were concerned, Lang and Sharnoff are not analogous art. Therefore, Lang may not properly be combined with Sharnoff and claims 1, 10, 14, 20 and 22, and the claims that depend therefrom should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

All the claims presently on file in the present application are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the application has now been brought into a condition where allowance of the case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Leonard T. Guzman
Reg. No. 46,308

Date: June 9, 2004

IBM Almaden Research Center
650 Harry Road
C45A/J2B
San Jose, CA 95120

Phone Number: 408-927-3377
Facsimile Number: 408-927-3375



APPENDIX A

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A system for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online
5 search comprising:

an information gathering device adapted to retrieve the document from an information
source;

an information analysis device adapted to determine an online id associated with at least
one author of the document; and

10 a credibility rating system adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated
with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one
credibility rating to the information analysis device, wherein the information analysis
device is adapted to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and
allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the
15 document.
2. The system of claim 1 further comprising a searchable index adapted to store an
association of the credibility rating of the online id with the document, wherein the
association is accessible by a search engine.
3. The system of claim 2 wherein the searchable index is adapted to map a unique
20 identifier associated with the document to the associated credibility rating.

4. The system of claim 1 wherein the document is a web page and the web page has a unique identifier comprising a uniform resource locator ("URL").

5. The system of claim 1 wherein the online search is an Internet search and the document is retrieved from the Internet.

5 6. The system of claim 1 wherein the credibility rating system comprises:

a user interface adapted to allow an owner of the online id to input information into the credibility rating system that can be validated and write the information into a credibility database wherein the information is stored and associated with the online id;

10 an input validator coupled to the user interface and adapted to verify that the input by the owner is correct and to determine the credibility rating, the credibility rating reflecting the input; and

an application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating stored in the credibility rating system.

15 7. The system of claim 6 wherein the user interface further comprises:

a profiling interface adapted to allow a mapping of the online id to an online credibility rating;

a rating import module adapted to allow rating information from outside sources to be linked to the credibility database; and

a message rating interface adapted to allow the online id to input statements related to a validity of the document and determine a weight of the statement based on a statement analysis, the weight of the statement being used by the input validator to determine the credibility rating.

5 8. The system of claim 6 further comprising a message posting module coupled to the credibility database and adapted to allow the owner of the online id to distribute a message linked to the credibility rating that allows a third party recipient to view the message and the credibility rating.

9. The system of claim 7 further comprising an application access point coupled to the
10 credibility database adapted to allow a third party to submit a query for the credibility rating associated with the online id.

10. A credibility rating system comprising:

a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an online id to input credibility information associated with the online id into the system for validation;

15 an input validator coupled to the user interface and adapted to verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted credibility information in the form of a credibility rating;

a credibility database adapted to store the on-line identifier and the associated credibility rating; and

an application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating from the credibility database.

11. The system of claim 10 wherein the user interface further comprises:

a profiling interface adapted to allow a mapping of the author identifier to an online credibility rating;

a rating import module adapted to allow rating information from outside sources to be linked to the credibility rating in the credibility database; and

a message rating interface adapted to determine a weight of the inputted credibility information based on a statement analysis of the inputted information.

12. The system of claim 10 further comprising a message posting module coupled to the credibility database and adapted to allow the author to distribute a message linked to the credibility rating and that allows a recipient to view the message and the credibility rating.

13. The system of claim 11 further comprising an application access point coupled to the credibility database adapted to allow a third party to submit a query for the credibility rating associated with an online identifier.

14. A method of associating a credibility rating to a document retrieved in an Internet search comprising the steps of:

determining an online id associated with at least one author the document;

retrieving at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating system not associated with the document; and

associating the at least one credibility rating with the document.

15. The method of claim 14 wherein the step of determining an online id of a document
5 comprises the step of extracting an author information code from a header tag of an HTML document.

16. The method of claim 14, further comprising the step of developing a credibility rating for an online id, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an input from the online id related to a credibility profile for the online id;
10 validating the input by determining a weight of the input;
assigning the credibility rating to the online id; and
storing the credibility rating in a searchable index.

17. The method of claim 15 further comprising the step of integrating the credibility rating vector into a search engine using a ranking algorithm.

15 18. The method of claim 14 further comprising the step of reordering a search result list comprising a list of documents returned from the Internet search relative to the credibility rating associated with each document.

19. The method of claim 16 further comprising the step of displaying a symbol on the information indicating the quality rating to the user.

20. A computer program product comprising:

a computer useable medium having a computer readable code device embodied therein
for causing a computer to associate a credibility rating with a document located in an
online search, the computer readable code device in the computer program product
5 comprising:

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve the
document from an information source;

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an
online id associated with at least one author of the document; and

10 a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve at least
one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating
database and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and
allow a user to access the credibility rating.

15 21. The computer program product of claim 20 further comprising:

a computer useable medium having computer readable code device embodied therein for
causing a computer to allow an owner of the online id to formulate the credibility
rating for the online id, the computer readable code device in the computer program
product comprising:

20 a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to allow the owner
of the online id to input information into the system that can be validated and write

the information into a credibility database wherein the information is stored and associated with the online id;

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to verify that the input by the owner is correct and determine the credibility rating based on the input; and

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to allow a third party to access the credibility rating stored in the credibility rating system.

22. An article of manufacture comprising:

a computer useable medium having a computer readable program code device embodied therein for causing a computer to associate a credibility rating with a document located in an online search, the computer readable code device in the article of manufacture comprising:

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve the document from an information source;

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document; and

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the credibility rating now associated with the document.

23. The article of manufacture of claim 22 further comprising:

a computer useable medium having a computer readable program code device embodied therein for causing a computer to allow an owner of the online id to develop a credibility rating profile for the online id, the computer readable code device in the article of manufacture comprising:

5 a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to allow the owner of the online id to input information into the system that can be validated and write the information into a credibility database wherein the information is stored and associated with the online id;

10 a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to verify that the input by the owner is correct and to determine the credibility rating relative to the input; and

a computer readable program code device for causing a computer to allow a third party to access the credibility rating stored in the credibility rating system.

15 24. The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one credibility rating associated with the online id includes subject matter specific credibility ratings.

25. The method of claim 24 wherein the information analysis device is adapted to correlate a subject matter of the document with the at least one credibility rating that corresponds to the subject matter of the document.

20 26. The method of claim 14 further comprising:
determining a subject matter of the document; and

associating with the document at least one credibility rating, from the at least one credibility rating associated with the online id, that corresponds to the subject matter of the document.

27. The system of claim 1 wherein the information gathering device and the information
5 analysis device are located in separate domains.

28. The system of claim 1 wherein the credibility rating is a rating of at least one author associated with the document.

29. The system of claim 1 wherein the credibility rating database holds credibility ratings for an online ID that are categorized by subject matter.

10 30. The method of claim wherein the at least one credibility rating comprises a credibility information vector based on a combination of credibility ratings in at least one subject domain associated with the online ID.

31. The method of claim 16 wherein the weight of the input is determined by a date input, a domain of the content, a time duration associated with the input and an action
15 associated with the input.



TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/805,808	RECEIVED JUL 08 2004 Technology Center 2100
	Filing Date	03/13/2001	
	First Named Inventor	Reiner Kraft	
	Art Unit	2171	
	Examiner Name	Hanh B. Thai	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	70	Attorney Docket Number	ARC920000147US1

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): 1. Return Postcard 2. Transmittal Form
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	LEONARD T. GUZMAN (Registration #46,308)
Signature	<i>Leonard T. Guzman</i>
Date	JUNE 9, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.	
Typed or printed name	Leonard T. Guzman
Signature	<i>Leonard T. Guzman</i>
Date	JUNE 9, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) **330.00**

Complete if Known

Application Number	09/805,808
Filing Date	03/13/2001
First Named Inventor	Reiner Kraft
Examiner Name	Hann B. Thai
Art Unit	2171
Attorney Docket No.	ARC920000147US1

RECEIVED
JUL 08 2004
Technology Center 2100

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None

☒ Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number: 09-0441
Deposit Account Name: IBM Corporation

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

☒ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Credit any overpayments

☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001 770	2001 385	Utility filing fee	
1002 340	2002 170	Design filing fee	
1003 530	2003 265	Plant filing fee	
1004 770	2004 385	Reissue filing fee	
1005 160	2005 80	Provisional filing fee	
SUBTOTAL (1)			(\$) 0.00

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

Total Claims: -20** = X =
Independent Claims: -3** = X =
Multiple Dependent: =

<u>Large Entity</u>		<u>Small Entity</u>		<u>Fee Description</u>
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	86	2201	43	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	290	2203	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	86	2204	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Small Entity

Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description
1051 130	2051 65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath
1052 50	2052 25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet
1053 130	1053 130	Non-English specification
1812 2,520	1812 2,520	For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination
1804 920*	1804 920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action
1805 1,840*	1805 1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action
1251 110	2251 55	Extension for reply within first month
1252 420	2252 210	Extension for reply within second month
1253 950	2253 475	Extension for reply within third month
1254 1,480	2254 740	Extension for reply within fourth month
1255 2,010	2255 1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month
1401 330	2401 165	Notice of Appeal
1402 330	2402 165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal
1403 290	2403 145	Request for oral hearing
1451 1,510	1451 1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding
1452 110	2452 55	Petition to revive - unavoidable
1453 1,330	2453 665	Petition to revive - unintentional
1501 1,330	2501 665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)
1502 480	2502 240	Design issue fee
1503 640	2503 320	Plant issue fee
1460 130	1460 130	Petitions to the Commissioner
1807 50	1807 50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)
1806 180	1806 180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt
8021 40	8021 40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)
1809 770	2809 385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))
1810 770	2810 385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))
1801 770	2801 385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)
1802 900	1802 900	Request for expedited examination of a design application

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) **330.00**

SUBMITTED BY

Name (Print/Type)	Leonard T. Guzman	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	46,308	Telephone	408-927-3377
Signature		Date	JUNE 9, 2004		

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.